

Machine upgrade and experiment protection



Well known, that machine and experiments have to some extent conflicting requirements, see opening talk, Steve Myers, 1st Collider experiments interface workshop <u>30 Nov 2012</u>

Machine upgrade,

more aperture

increased intensity, energy, luminosity

Experiments inner detectors close to the beam low backgrounds, radiation, activation safe stable operation

3000 fb-1 in each IP 1 and 5 with luminosity leveling and optimal conditions or at least well tolerable, stable, safe running conditions for all experiments

Based on the work for the HL-LHC in collaboration between several work packages and the experiments : WP1 management incl. coordination WG, WP2 Accelerator physics (aperture needs for optics), WP4 Crab cavities, WP5 Collimation, WP7 machine protection, WP8 collider experiment interface WP10 energy deposition, WP 13 beam diagnostics ...





new inner Be beam pipes in IP1 and IP5, implemented in LS1 (LEB, Mark Gallilee et al.)

30% reduction from 29 mm to 21.7 mm inner radius for CMS and 23.5 mm for ATLAS



lhcvc5c_0028-vAA

TAS : charged particle absorber and passive protection TAS, radius 17 mm

Including sagging, the reduced beam pipes remain in the shadow of the TAS after LS1







Reduction of β^* (to 15 cm for round beams) increases the beam size and crossing angle in the triplet

Requires new, 2 × larger aperture triplet the inner coil diameter increases from 70 mm to 150 mm

TAS radius increased by nearly 2 × from 17 mm to 30 mm

Crab cavities after D2, D2 moved 13 m closer to IP

potential advantage in β^* levelling, i.e. starting the fill at increased β^* reduces the beam size in the triplet and long-range beam-beam (would allow for reduced crossing angle at constant separation in terms of sigma)





https://espace.cern.ch/HiLumi/WP3/SitePages/Home.aspx



HL-LHC, triplet inner coil diameter 150 mm



CP corrector package DFB distribution feed box SM service modules (cables..)

MCBX orbit correctors, used for crossing angle and parallel separation at IP (inj.)





Close collaboration with the experiments

Contact persons for

- ATLAS : Beniamino Di Girolamo, Antonello Sbrizzi
- CMS : Austin Ball, Anne Dabrowski







WP7 - machine protection, Daniel Wollman, Markus Zerlauth, Jörg Wenninger et al.

Active machine protection : beam loss monitoring (BLM) + fast (within 3 turns) beam dump Already proven to be essential and reliable for the present LHC

- even more important for the HL-LHC

Most relevant in the context discussed here is top energy, fully squeezed, IP1 + 5

- Crab cavity failures detailed simulations started and first results illustrated
- Asynchronous beam dump (beam 2 to CMS...) extend study <u>L. Lari at al, IPAC13</u> to HL-LHC
- UFO's or non-conformities (rf-fingers) resulting in showers with local production of offmomentum and neutral particles around the experiments

Scenarios which should not become more dangerous, still to be followed up :

- D1 failures, will be superconducting which leaves more time to dump the beam
- Any new equipment, moving objects: it was decided to not use fast vacuum valves around the experiments
- + injection, TDI, IP2 + IP8 ...



HL-LHC beam envelopes and apertures







HL-LHC beam envelopes and apertures









- Phase Failure of the first crab cavity at IP5 on the left side (Beam 1)
- Failure in 1 turn : the phase of the cavity drops from 0° to 90°



• NB : no losses observed for the core distribution - only the results for the halo distribution are presented

Frederic Bouly, Bruce Rendon, Tobias Baer

tracking with SIXTRACK





3 turns after the failure Beam 1 IP5 horizontal plane Normal CC (Crab Cavity) Failure triplet triplet IP5 TYANG 52 150 100 50 X (mm) ~5% -50 -100 -150 -150 -100 -50 50 100 150 0 s (m)

Frederic Bouly





Beam 1 IP5 **5** turns after the failure horizontal plane Normal **CC** (Crab Cavity) Failure triplet triplet IP5 200 150 100 50 X (mm) ~14% -50 -100 -150 -200 -150 -50 50 -100 0 100 150 s (m)

First results rather encouraging:

Frederic Bouly

fast but still manageable growth times protected by collimator system

10





TAN absorber for neutral collision debries (n, γ) in front of D2 in IP1 and IP5 minimal TAN or shielding or TCLs also planned for IP8

LHC \rightarrow HL-LHC, LS3

- changes in geometry, D2 and TAN 13 m closer to IP
- 2× larger crossing angle ($142.5 \rightarrow 295 \mu rad$)
- larger beams at TAN (increased β -functions), keep n1 > 7
- increased energy deposition (200 W → 1000 W)

TAN redesign needed





Schematic geometry up to 180 m from IP1, 5









by Francesco Cerutti, Luigi Esposito / WP10, horizontal crossing angle (IP5)



0.12 protons/collision (32.3% cleaned) 0.061 others/collision (98.5% cleaned)



At TAN entrance, the offset due to crossing angle is ~ 142.5µrad × 141 m ≈ 2.1 cm ⇒ neutrals flying along the crossing angle well within TAN acceptance







by Francesco Cerutti, Luigi Esposito / WP10, horizontal crossing angle (IP5)



0.17 protons/collision (28.4% cleaned*)
0.35 others /collision (59.2% cleaned*)
* by a TCL with horizontal aperture at that position



At TAN entrance, the offset due to crossing angle is ~ 295µrad × 126 m ≈ 3.7 cm ⇒ neutrals flying along the crossing angle close to edge of TAN acceptance

TAN aperture rectellipse 37/32 mm, sep 160 mm

Satisfying all round/flat optics options using our original (generous) tolerances results in a rather large TAN aperture relies on TCL to protect D2 and leaves an increased fraction of collision debris going into Q5, Q6, Q7 matching section and dispersion suppressor -- currently reviewed by WP2, 5, 8, 10





WP 13 beam diagnostics, Rhodri Jones, Bernd Dehning et al.

HL-LHC

upgrades in collimation section, reduced noise

IRs : maintain BLMs external to cryostat

add cryogenic BLMs monitors in triplet (6 per magnet) to monitor more directly

losses at the coils and be able to dump before quenching

note :

detecting abnormal beam losses close to experiments more difficult in HL-LHC increased triplet size and increased level of collision debries crucial for experiments to have their own monitoring/protection, BCMs





- The high-luminosity upgrade implies a major redesign of the layout around IP1 and IP5
- Machine aperture will nearly double around the high luminosity interaction regions resulting in a significant reduction in passive protection (TAS, TAN)
- We are in the process of critically reviewing tolerances and apertures to minimize the loss in passive protection in close collaboration between the HL-HLC work packages and experiments
- We rely on active protection based on beam loss monitoring by the machine + experiments + fast beam dump
- A list of potentially dangerous failure scenarios has been established, and is studied by detailed simulations

Backup

Steady state signal and collision debris contamination



 Development of a sensor to be placed in the cold mass of the triplet magnets (2 Kelvin, 1 Tesla)





Bernd Dehning

Beam loss acquisition system upgrade for HL-LHC

- Front end electronic:
 - Development of a radiation tolerant integrated circuit to overcome cable noise limitations for threshold settings
- Back end electronic:
 - Development of a FPGA VME carrier card to increase system availability and overcome FPGA limitations for threshold logic implementations



Bernd Dehning



present TAN, designed by LBNL

œ

Functional Specification LHC IP1/IP5 NEUTRAL BEAM ABSORBERS (TAN)Egon Hoyer, William Elliott, William Turner / LBNL, EDMS 108093 from 2002



1.1m x 3.7m block with Cu absorber, 210 W at 1e34cm-1s-1 position, starts at 140 m from IP



Two beam separation, MAD-X survey







Beam-gas background



